

15

THE
Divine Institution
OF
INFANT-BAPTISM,
AND THE
Mode of Sprinkling

Briefly Vindicated by Reason and
Holy Scripture,

Against *R. Morgan's* Insignificant and pretended Answer to the Author's Arguments, for Infant-Baptism.

Where his Weak Exceptions, and his False, Deceitful, and Frivolous Reflections are Noted.

-
- I. As Christ hath Commanded Infants to come to him, so the Apostles did not Exclude them from Baptism, because Baptism is Compared by *Paul* to Circumcision, *Col. 2.* where he plainly declares; That Infants also are to be introduc'd into the Church by Baptism. *Magdeb. Conf. 1. l. 2. c. 4.*
 - II. Infants are Baptized because of Original Sin. *Hom. on Al. Ez.* Rebaptization is to Crucify Christ again. *Hom. de Paul. Chryost.*
 - III. By Baptism Christ will have his to be Regenerated, and we are thereby enter'd into his Fold, and such as have no Baptism cannot be saved, saith *St. Augustine.*

London: Printed by *E. E.* and are to be Sold by
W. TAYLOR, at the *Ship*, and *H. CLEMENTS*, at
the *Half-Moon*, in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*, 1708.
(Price Three Pence.)



A

F

His
Imp
no c
Igno
his C
Line
L.
civil
to
ties
Ria
Chr
dire

(r)
A
Reply to R. Morgan,

THE
ANABAPTIST,
OR;
Dipper.

R *Morgan* pretends to answer my ;
Arguments for Infant - Baptism,
• but to what Purpose, I leave to
the Impartial Reader to Judge.
His whole Performance is Scandalous and
Imperfect, a continued Libel, and serves to
no other Intent, but to discover his Folly,
Ignorance ; Malice , and the weakness of
his Cause , as I shall prove in the following
Lines.

I. I shall pass over his Abusive and Un-
civil Title Page, and his seeming to deny
to my Person, and Character, the Quali-
ties of a Gentleman, a Scholar, or a Chri-
stian. To begin with my first Argument,
Christ's Invitation and express Command,
directed to the Apostles as Rulers of the
A. 2 Christian

Christian Church, and consequently to their Successors the Bishops and Ministers. *Suffer little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not. For of such is the Kingdom of God.* Matth. 19. 14. Mark. 10. 14. Luke 18. 16. Which Words related by three Evangelists, all the Christian Churches of all Ages and Nations, and all orthodox Divines understand for an expresse Order, to bring our Infants to him in his Ordinance of Baptism, and thereby into Covenant with God, as the *Jews* Children were by Circumcision. For now Christ is in Heaven, we have no other way to comply with his Command. And it had been insignificant, if it had related only to the Children of that Age and Nation; because Christ was then going up to *Jerusalem* to suffer Death, at the latter End of his Ministry. Besides this Exposition of coming to Christ agrees with other Texts of Holy Scripture where the same Expression is mentioned, as *Matth. 11. 28. John. 6. 37.* Where a Coming into the Church, which is our Saviour's Mystical Body, to be Members of it, is plainly to be understood. For none can come to Christ now, that he is absent from us, but must be initiated into his Holy Religion; and 'tis undoubted, that the initiating Ordinance is Baptism. Therefore, when Christ invites Infants to come to him, he means into his Church and Kingdom, of which he tells us they are in that tender Age fit Subjects, and capable to be admitted

mitted. 'Tis apparent that this Order was deliver'd to the Apostles, in opposition to the Offence, they had taken at the bringing little Children to Christ. For they esteem'd them unfit for his Communion and Society. And it is likewise probable, that *John the Baptist* took not any Notice of them at his Baptism, which was confer'd upon the Adult only, to prepare them for the Reception of the *Messiah*, upon the Confession of their Sins. Infants, as they were not able to make any such Confession, they had no such need, as those of Riper Years, being already within the Covenant by Circumcision, and having not committed since any actual transgression. Therefore it was unreasonable to require any Profession of Repentance from them, or any acknowledgment of their Errors. But because the Apostles would have excluded them from Christ, this moved his Displeasure, and occasioned that express Command, which he left as a Rule for the Governours, and Ministers of his Church; *To suffer little Children, sucking Babes, to come unto him, and not to forbid them.* He adds the reason of this Order. *For of such is the Kingdom of God;* That is, They in their Infancy were fit Subjects of his Kingdom, fit Members to be introduc'd into his Church, and enrol'd amongst his Servants and People, without being partakers of *John's* Baptism, of which they had no need. How impertinently does *R. M.* Answer the Argu-

ments drawn from these Words of Christ? He tells us; we deny that their *Coming* to Christ signifies their admittance to Baptism, &c. I reply, They, who brought them in their Arms, and their *Coming* was intended only that Christ might lay his Hands upon them, and Bless them. Therefore if there had been no more said, but that they came and were brought to him, and that he bestowed upon them his Blessing, we could have drawn no Conclusion nor Reason from thence to Baptize Babes. But when we hear our Bless'd Master at his Departure out of the World command; *To suffer Little Children to come unto him, &c.* And withal informs us, *That of such is his Kingdom*, we cannot but in Obedience to this Precept bring them unto him, into his Kingdom, to be Subjects of it, and into his Mystical Body his Church, to be Members of it, and to enter them into it by Baptism. Christ carried his Thoughts and Direction further than those Charitable People, who brought the Children, or as his Apostles conceived at first, as we may Judge by the Reason, that he gives of his Invitation to come to him, *for of such is his Kingdom*. 'Tis therefore such a *Coming*, that our Saviour understands, whereby they are to be made partakers of his Kingdom, and introduc'd into it. Shall he assure us by these Words, that this Kingdom belongs to them, and to such as they were, and shall we keep them out? Or have our Adversaries

versaries any other way, or expedient of Divine Institution to bring Infants to Christ, to be registred Subjects of his Kingdom, besides Baptism? If they have, let them inform us. For we know of no other method, but this approved of by our Redeemer.

But my wise Adversary accuses me wrongfully of perverting the Greek Text, because in *Matth. 19. 14.* The preposition *pros*, I have affixed before the verb *elthein*, tho' the sense is the same after as before. For *elthein. pros me*, or *pros ton Christon*, is the same signification, as *proselthein to Christo*, to come to me, or to come to Christ. So he may find it in *Heb 7. 25.* and *Heb 11. 6.* If *R. M.* had been in his right senses, he would not have made such a needless exception, and Publickly slander'd me, and accused me falsely of perverting the Greek Text. By which Act he has betrayed his own Ignorance and weakness of Judgment. Now from this word used by St. *Matthew* in Christ's Command, I gather the Intention of our blessed Master; That in regard the word *Profelyte* is from thence derived, our Saviour thereby intimates; That it is such a *Coming* he understands, whereby Children are to be profelyted to him, and initiated into his Church and Kingdom. 'Tis a Remark that I have since found in *Doctor Hammond* and others who have been guilty of the same Crime, of perverting the Greek Text, in the Judgement of my Ignorant Answerer. The Drs. words are these. *Christ*

was

was so far from excepting against the Age of Children, as a prejudice or hindrance to their Coming to him (that is, to their Profelytism) that he affirms them to be the pattern of those, of whom his Kingdom is to be made up. And Mr Wills; The Children are brought to him by others, yet they are said to come unto him, Matth. 19. el-
 thein pros the very words of which Profelyte is made Page. 124. My extravagant Antagonist tells us twice, that he Wonders. Truly an Anabaptist is a Wonder to all Christian Professors; that they should acknowledge their Infants infected with Original Sin, in their Publick Confession, and will not allow them the Remedy, that Christ hath prescribed to exempt them from it, by the mercy of God, namely the Ordinance of Baptism under the Gospel, as Circumcision was appointed under, and before the Law for that purpose.

Now is R. M. so weak as to think, that he can with a Wonder baffle all the Arguments, that a number of Protestant Divines gather from this Command of Christ to warrant the Baptism of Infants? But what is the cause of his Wonder? Is he so impious to wonder at Christ's Commission and Order? Or at the Interpretation of this Order, so understood as we do, by all the Christian Churches in the World? We have much more reason to pity and wonder at his Simplicity, in dismembring the account of the Evengalists, by saying, little Children came, or were rather brought to Christ and blessed by him, and to endeavour

deavour to ridicule our Argument for Infant Baptism by a foolish conclusion from imperfect Premises, or to think that we conclude the Baptism of Infants from thence? No 'tis from the order of Christ, to suffer Children to come to him &c. Which cannot now be reasonably understood in any other Sense, but to be Baptized into his Church, and Profession. This the words *proserchomai* or *proserchesthai to Christo* signify in the word of God. Therefore how vainly and impertinently does he tell us; That *proserchomai* does not always signify to *profelyte*. That word alone never did signify any such matter, neither in the Word of God nor in any other Author. It signifies only *to come*, but with the addition from Christ, to come to me, or to Christ. If Children have no other expedient to come to him, but by being Baptized or Profelyted thereby to him, it must necessarily follow, that it imports, what I have expressed; and the meaning, that I have given to the words that they are to be Baptized to him. Let the Reader judge by this Instance which of us two is guilty of perverting the word of God; I that give it a right sense agreeable with other Protestant Divines, or he that wrests, mangles and dismember's this narrative of three Evengelists to make it comply with his erroneous Principles and deceive the unadvised Reader.

But methinks the reason Christ adds, to justify his Invitation of Childrens coming to him. That of such is the Kingdom of God and the

the *Kingdon of Heaven*. That is, the Kingdom of the Messiah, the Kingdom of Grace and Glory, should satisfy all reasonable Souls. Doubtless if they belong to it as proper Subjects, or if it belongs to them by any Right or Title, they ought to be enter'd into it by that Institution, that our Saviour hath appointed for that purpose, which is Baptism. Upon which words, how impertinently does my wise School-Master argue? To repeat this faith he, *is enough to confute it, while as I think no less can be meant but that Baptism confers Grace*. If the poor man understood English he would find no such Assertion in my whole Book. Neither do I advance any such Doctrine here or else where, but what is conformable to the Current of the Holy Scripture, our Excellent Rubrick and the Confessions of all Protestant Churches: That only the Spirit of God can confer saving Grace. But we must introduce our Infants by Prayer and Baptism into that Church, where this Holy Spirit works upon the minds of Men, and produceth that Grace, which by the mercy of God is effectual to Salvation. Is there no Difference between being enter'd in the Church of God, admitted visible Members of it, and being endowed with the heavenly Graces? The first advantage is procured to us by Christ's Institution of Baptism; the latter depends upon the Agency of the Holy Ghost. I say no more than our Church has declar'd; that Baptism is the Entrance into our Holy Profession

Profession. And Mr. Tombes the Anabaptist confesseth the same. *I grant saith he, that Baptism is the Way and manner of our solemn Admission into the Church, I mean, the regular Way.* My Adversary understands not his own Catechism, and Confession of Faith, that affirms; *Baptism becomes effectual means of Salvation only by the Blessing of Christ, &c.* Therefore his Notions that I joyn with the Church of Rome, in affirming, that Baptism of Water confers saving Grace, are idle, false, impertinent and Scaandalous.

My Antagonist returns no Answer to all the Reasonings and Conclusions deducible from this Invitation of Christ, but proceeds to tell us; That it is a *Declaration of the Goodness of God to Infants, which Grace no Infants ordained of God to so great a Blessing shall ever lose, by any real, or supposed Neglect of Men.* He tells us great News, That this is a Declarative of the Goodness of God to Infants. But what Goodness is here meant? Is there any other Goodness, but what the Words import? That Infants should come to Christ, to be Registred Members and Subjects of his Spiritual Kingdom? Were ever any ordained to a Blessing without the means appointed to convey it to them? To depend upon the Ordination to an End, without the assistance of Inferior Causes, is a fanatick Madness, and an *Antinomian* Principle. Did ever Christ Declare his Goodness

Goodness to any, but to such as came, or were brought to him? or are they who are plung'd in the polluted State of Nature, out of Covenant with God, as all unbaptized Infants are, capable of, and fit for the Reception of God's Spiritual Blessings without his Ordinance? Does not Christ to the Woman of *Syrophenicia* Name such Dogs? *'Tis not Meet to give the Children's Bread to Dog's.* And the Apostle tells us, *That they are Children of Wrath without Christ and God.* And are such who continue in that State, ordained for the Divine Blessings, and Favours, without a compliance with Christ's Institution, for the remission of Original Sin? He adds; If Baptism were intended here, it would have been spoken of. I Reply; How many things are intended and implied in the Holy Scripture, that are not expressly Named? Therefore this Supposition is false, and ill grounded. Likewise his saying that this Invitation of Christ *was long before his Death* is false, and contrary to what *St. Mark.* affirms, *vers. 33 and 34; That Christ was then going up to Jerusalem to suffer Death And that it was spoken for another purpose,* than that Children should come to him, to be partakers of his Kingdom, is nonsense, and contrary to the express Words of Christ. To require Children to be then Baptized was not seasonable. Because these *Jewish* Infants were then already in Covenant with God by Circumcision, and the Baptism

Baptism of Christ was not then an establish'd Ordinance while the *Jewish* Dispensation lasted, which continued till the Death of Christ. It was sufficient for him to give a General Direction for that purpose to his Holy Apostles, to be practised and take place, after his Resurrection. How well he Answers my Appeal? Whether this Text is not much more intelligible for Infant-Baptism, than God's saying; *I am the God of Abraham*, &c. was to prove the real Subsistence of Souls, and the Resurrection from the Dead let the Reader Judge. *R. M.* makes no satisfactory Answer, but saith; *should such a Divine Logician draw the Consequence from the Text in Controversy, for Infant-Baptism, we would Heartily submit.* I reply. What Consequence the Universal Church of Christ, which is directed by Christ's Holy Spirit, according to his Promise, concludes and infers from Scripture is a Truth and Consequence drawn by this Divine Logician. Now the present universal Church of Christ draws this Conclusion, and Consequence from this Text, as we do. Therefore this Consequence, and Conclusion is a Truth drawn from this Text by this Divine Logician, and his Holy and Infallible Spirit: 'Tis very strange that our Adversaries are so wilfully blind, as not to understand here Christ's express Command and Order, for the Baptizing of our Infants.

2. The 2d Argument is taken from *Matth. 28. 14. Go ye and teach, or Disciple*

all Nations, Baptizing them, &c. Now if we Consider the Circumstances of this General Commission of Christ, to Disciple all Nations by Baptism, we may from them infer the Baptism of Infants. First this Order was to Baptize, instead of to Circumcise; and as that was an Entrance into the *Levitical Church*, this was to be an Introduction into the Christian. Therefore the same Persons, who were capable of the former, without a Prohibition might reasonably be Judg'd fit for the latter. And the rather, because the Act or Ceremony of Admittance was much more favourable and less painful, than the former was. Therefore the Divine Wisdom could not probably be more severe, than it was before, by excluding any who had then any Right to be partakers of the Grace of God. Secondly this Commission was deliver'd to the Apostles, *Jews*, whom Christ had Com-manded, to *suffer little Children to come unto him*, who knew the Privileges of the *Jewish Church*, and the constant Practice of that Church, to admit Parents and their Children together into Covenant with God. Therefore, since there is here no Excep-tion of Infants, there needed no other discovery of the Intention of our Saviour to comprise Infants, but this General Or-der. *Go ye and Disciple all Nations by Bap-tism.* Thirdly the Persons Mentioned to be Baptized in this collective and comprehen-sive

five
well
bers
the
Mat
and
to t
Babe
instr
nific
as t
sons
Inte
shou
tism
W
ral C
faith
from
a fa
tors
vert
repe
rard
Dis
and
our
auto
and
Chil
rant
than
teac
lear

five Word *All Nations*, includes Infants as well as the Adult, they being also Members and a Part of the Nations. Fourthly the Term used in the Commission which is *Matheteusate*, that signifies both to teach, and to Disciple, the first in reference to the Adult, the Second to the Innocent Babes, who are not yet of an Age to be instructed. By this Word of a double signification, relating to the Young as well as the Old, to Infants as well as to Persons of Riper Years, we may understand the Intention of Christ was, that the Infants should be received into his Church by Baptism, and Discipled as well as their Parents.

What saith my *Antagonist* to this General Commission? 'Tis a pretty way of Arguing, saith he, to pervert a Text, and then to draw from it such Consequences as they please. What a false Reflection is this upon all Expositors of the Word of God? As if we perverted the Text by interpreting *Matheteusin*, to Disciple. Let him hear what Gerard saith, *Matheteusin* is properly to make Disciples, by Preaching the Word to the Adult, and by administering Baptism to Infants. And our learned Whitaker saith; *Matheteusate autous*, first belongs to Men of Riper Years, and by Virtue of the Covenant also to their Children. But I cant think R. M. so ignorant, as he seems to be, by telling us *Manthano* is used in no other sense, but to teach or instruct; whereas it signifies to learn: But *Matheteusate*, which is derived

14 *A Reply to R. Morgan,*

from *Matheteuo*, signifies to teach or Instruct, or to Disciple. Besides *R. M.* is so indiscreet, as to quote a Text against himself when he saith of *John. 4. 1. where to make Disciples, has a quite different sense from Baptism.* And yet the Evangelist declares, That *Jesus made and Baptized more Disciples than John.* He contradicts himself and the Text, for they were not made Disciples without Baptism, as is there expressed.

What *Irenaeus* speaks of Adult Persons, which could not be made Disciples without Teaching, relates not to the case of Infants, who may be enroled and their Names enter'd into Christ's School, to be afterwards instructed in his Holy Profession. Again the Holy Ghost calls Infants *Disciples*, *Acts. 15. 16.* where the Yoke to be put upon the Neck of the Disciples was *Circumcision*, as is exprest *v. 5.* which was allowed to Infants at 8 Days Old. And if those Infants could not be reckon'd *Disciples* without first being Baptized, when they were thus Named, 'tis more than probable that they had been admitted to that Ordinance. Now if our Adversaries will argue, that none can be Nominated *Disciples*, till they can be taught, we may with as good Reason, argue from *Mark. 16. 16. Whoever believeth not shall be Damned*; That all Infants are certainly Damned, because they cannot actually believe. But as this Inference is false, so is theirs in Relation to Infants *Discipleship.*

3. The third Argument of the necessity of

of Infant Baptism succeeding to Infant-Circumcision he stiles a *Thread-bare Argument*. And asks *whether it follows, that it must have the same Subjects*. Can any give any solid reasons, why Infants should not be brought into Covenant with God under the Gospel, as well as under and before the Law? Since this is a more favourable Dispensation than that; why should Infants be excluded now from God's favour more than they were then? *R. M.* or any other of his Sect cannot give any good Reason, for the exclusion of Infants, nor answer the Arguments drawn from Infant's Circumcision. They were by God's expresse Command admitted Church members, and this Command was never repealed, but is yet in force under the Gospel. But this nonsensical Fellow answers with contempt to all my Arguments drawn from this *Topick*, and saith *there are a great heap of words to a small degree of sense*. I appeal to the impartial Reader, what degree of sense is in this Expression and base reflection, and whether this be a satisfactory Answer to all the Reasons that I alledge. For if Baptism is ordain'd in lieu of Circumcision, 'tis a Seal of the Gospel Covenant to be applied to all that belong to it. And if the Promises, that appertain to this Covenant, relate to our Children, as well as to our selves, as the Holy Scripture declares, they are to be confirm'd into it by this Seal of Baptism, this sign of the Grace of God, of the Death of Christ, and of the Benefits purchased by the merits of his Cross.

R. M. Saith next; *That the New Covenant is said to come in the room and instead of the old, unto which belongs Circumcision. And yet we must not argue that therefore the new is a Covenant of works, because it follows that which was so.* I perceive by these Expressions, that R. M. is infected with the Antinomian Heresy, as much as that of the Anabaptists, which affirms our obedience to the Commands of the Gospel to be of no use in our Salvation, and that the new Covenant requires no such thing from us, contrary to the Doctrine of St. Peter Ep. 1. Ch. 1 v. 2. and St. Paul Rom. 1. 5. 16, 20. 26. But tho' the new Covenant is not a Covenant of works, that is, the Mercies of the Covenant and Salvation, are not granted in consideration of our works and merits, it would be no Covenant if there were not an Agreement and Stipulation between God and the Creature; And something is required on our Part, as well as on that of our Redeemer, to obtain the promises and blessings, which are conditional. And what reason have we to exclude Infants from the Gospel Covenant, and from the seal of it, since they were admitted into the former? Were they proper Subjects and Members of the Covenant of works, and not of the Covenant of Grace? of that Covenant that promises without works, to be merciful to their unrighteousness and their Sins and iniquities, to remember no more Heb. 8. 12? Pray let our Adversaries give some reasonable Answer, to this plain Question. He

He proceeds next to Argue from the Lord's Supper succeeding to the *Paschal Lamb*, and says; *That Infants did partake of the Lamb, why do not they bring them to the Lord's Table, as some of the Fathers did?* I Answer R. M's Assertion is false, That Infants did eat of the *Paschal Lamb*. We read of no such thing in all the Mosaick Law. Only the Children, that could speak and be instructed in the Reasons of that Institution; 'tis probable they were partakers of it. But sucking Infants were not fit for, nor able to feed on such food; and it cannot be proved that it was intended for them. We bring them not to the Lor'ds Table, for these Reasons. Because 'tis a Sacrament where actual Faith is required to confirm our Interest in God and Christ. Is there any reason, because a Novice may be enter'd into the lowest degree in Christ's School, therefore he must be advanc'd to the highest? 2. The Lord's Supper is a Commemoration of the Death of Christ; Now Infants cannot answer the End, nor receive the Benefits of that Sacrament, as they can of Baptism, where God treats them according to their Capacities and admits them into his Church. 3. In the Lords Supper is a Self-examination required, as a preparative, for the Reception, of which Infants are incapable, 4. Neither is there any such necessity for their eating of the Bread and Wine, as for their Baptism. For by this Institution they are taken out of the state of Nature, and enter'd into the state of Grace

18 *A Reply to R. Morgan.*

Grace and Mercy, without which their Salvation is doubtful. But there is no such Necessity of the Lord's Supper till they come to Years of Discretion. They may then rest secure upon the promised Mercy of God till such a Time.

4. To my 4th Argument drawn from 1 Cor. 7. 14. from the Holiness of Believers Children, how absurd and pedantick does *R. M.* appear in his Answer? *What Holiness soever is meant in the Text, I think, saith he, Baptism of Infants can't be infer'd from thence.* That is; no kind of Holiness can qualify them for Baptism. Does he fancy his bare Thoughts able to satisfy our Consciences in this Point, and Answer all the Arguments drawn from this Text? Both his thinking Faculty, and his Rational are so infirm, that we can lay no weight upon either. He proceeds on in his Impertinences. *Because, saith he, if a Husband or a Wife be a Believer, then it gives a Right not only to the Infants of such a Believer, but also to the Unbelieving Husband or Wife, and all their Adult Children, tho' they are Infidels.* This is argued like a Wise Man of Gotham. For the Case is different. All Adult Husbands Wives and Children ought to profess their own Belief before Baptism. Neither are they Capable of it, while they continue in their Infidelity. But in Infants we meet with no such Indisposition. Therefore, saith *St. Paul*, if but one of the Parents be a Believer, the Children issuing from them are Holy, by *Designation*, and by God's

God's Right and Claim to them, as his, and their Title to be Dedicated to God, and consequently to be Baptized, and enter'd into Covenant with him. And whereas St. Paul affirms; That the *Unbelieving Husband is Sanctified by the Wife, and the Unbelieving Wife is Sanctified by the Husband*, is not spoken in Relation to their Persons, but in Relation to such Issue, which are said to be Holy by Reason of God's Propriety in them, and Claim to them, expressed in his Promise, to be the God of the Believing Seed. Therefore this Sanctification extends no further than as they are Husbands or Wives, in respect of such Children, or in Relation to the Act and Order of Generation, or their Legitimate Offspring proceeding from a Parent in Covenant with God. Some of the Fathers have judg'd them Holy, because they were Baptized, and thereby admitted amongst the Number of the Saints, which Interpretation, if it be allowed, we cannot have a clearer Text and Precedent for the Baptizing of Infants in the Primitive Church.

5. To the Fifth Argument taken from the Baptism of whole Households, R. makes no Answer. But tho' the Scripture mentions not Expressly Children to have belong'd to them, if we Baptize our Households, or whole Families as they did, I hope our Adversaries will grant, that we have a sufficient Warrant and Precedent from the Word of God for our Practice, and that in
this

this Particular we follow their Example.

6 The Sixth Argument borrowed from Acts 2. 39. where St. Peter affirms to the Converted Jews, That the *Promise is unto you, and to your Children*, Therefore Parents are required to Repent, and to be Baptized. This *Promise* here mention'd is not the *Promise* of the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost as R. M. and Mr. Stennet perversly and unadvisedly affirm. For how Children and Infants, who cannot speak one Language, should be Capable of the Gift of speaking many, may puzzle R. M's thinking Faculty to imagin. Neither do we find any such *Promise* made to Infants, in the Old Testament. Therefore St. Peter's Words refer to the *Promise* of Gen. 17. 7. *I will Establish my Covenant with thee, and thy Seed, after thee, &c. To be a God unto thee, and thy Seed after thee, &c.* This *Promise* agrees with St. Peter's Exhortation, *Repent and be Baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ for the remission of Sins, &c.* They were to repent of the Murder of Christ, and of their other Sins, and to be Baptized into his Holy Profession for the Obtaining the Divine Favour, and the remission of their Sins. Then he adds; *The Promise is to you and your Children, and to all that are a far off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.* All had not the Gifts of Miracles, of Healing, and of Tongues; Neither were they proper for the Capacity of Infants.

But

But the Promise to be their God, which implies the Remission of Sins, was fit for them in their tender Age. As therefore by St. Peter's Assertion, they had a Right to that Promise, they had also a Right to the Seal of it, and of the Covenant. R. M's saying, The Children were also call'd upon to Repent is false. The Parents indeed were call'd upon to Repent before Baptism; for they needed such a predisposition to fit them for that Institution. But there is not one Word mentioned of the Repentance of their Children, who being within the Covenant by Circumcision, had Committed no actual Transgression since; therefore needed no Repentance. But without it were to accompany their Parents; and with them to be admitted to the Seal of the Gospel Covenant, which is Baptism. This was the true sense and Meaning of St. Peter's saying; *The Promise, that is of Grace and Mercy and of the Divine Favour, is to you and to your Children.* To tell us of our Church, and the Scripture's Requiring Repentance and Faith, as necessary at Baptism, they are to be understood in Relation to the Adult, and not in Relation to Children, who as our Catechism Declares, are to be admitted without any actual Faith or Repentance, they being then in their Infancy, fully as Capable of that Ordinance, as the same Infants were of Circumcision, and the Benefits of it under the Law.

7. The 7th is a Question which I offer to our Adversaries, who believe as we do, Original Sin in Infants, according to St. Paul's Doctrine *Eph. 2. 3. 12.* of David *Psal. 51. 5.* and of Job, *14. 4. and 25. 5.* And as our Adversaries Profess in their Catechism and Confession of Faith; what Method can they Propose to Obtain or Procure Salvation to their Infants dying before they come to Riper Years, otherwise than by Baptism, Christ's Ordinance for the Remission of Sins? R. M. returns into his former Dream, that I joyn with the Church of Rome to assert; That *Baptism confers Grace ex opere operato.* Which as I have already said is false and a Slander, which none can gather from my Words, but my extravagant and abusive School-Master. Therefore the Example of *Simon Magus*, is very impertinent. But this Wiseman pretends to inform me of the Doctrine of our Church, of which I have been a Teacher above 40 Years, as if I knew it not. *Sic Sus Minervam docet.* He quotes next half the Definition of a Sacrament, and with his usual absurdity, tells us; That if *Baptism is the Sign of an inward and Spiritual Grace,* 'tis not the Grace it self. Very acutely argued, like a Doctor of Sorbonne. 'Tis as if he should say; The Body of R. Morgan riding upon an Ass in a Sun Shiny-Day, casts a shadow upon the Ground, but the shadow is not the Man nor the Ass. I must needs here Commend him for a very subtile and skilful Logician. But

I cannot approve of his mangling the Definition of a Sacrament, and Omitting the Essential Part. *Tis an outward and visible Sign of an inward and Spiritual Grace, given to us, and Ordained by Christ himself, as a Means whereby we receive the same, and a Pledge to assure us thereof.* Why does he leave out the latter Part? 'Tis because, he will not allow Baptism to be a means, whereby we receive the inward and Spiritual Grace, nor a Pledge to assure us thereof. As if Christ's Ordinances were insignificant Signs. He saith next. *That the Sacraments are not necessarily Conveyers of Grace to the Soul.* If he means by necessarily, not always and constantly, then he supposes, that sometimes they are Conveyers of Grace to the Soul. If that be his meaning, he seems to Contradict himself. However, he should have let us understood, whether it were a Physical or Moral Necessity of conveying Grace, that he denies to the Sacraments. We deny the first, as well as he, and for the latter 'tis disputable. But I suppose that his aim is, that there is no Necessity for the Sacraments to Convey Grace, that he Fancies is bestowed upon Infants, without the Administration of Christ's Institution, which he can never prove out of Scripture, either by Promise or Example. And tho' Baptism of Water does not of it self convey Grace, 'tis often conveyed unto us, and to Infants in Baptism, by Virtue of Christ's appointment, and Promise annexed to his

C

Ordinance,

24 *A Reply to R. Morgan,*

Ordinance, and by the Mercy and Spirit of God, and they do undoubtedly receive the Forgiveness of Original Sin, and are enter'd into a State of Grace by the outward Administration as our Church Teaches in the *Rubrick*, and so saith *Bucan* in his *Loc. Comm.* upon Baptism. *All Sins are pardon'd in Baptism both Original and actual.* To this agrees *St. Ambrose* *The Grace of God in Baptism forgives all things.* And *St. Chrysost.* *ad Pop. Antioch Hom. 21* saith; *The Laver of Baptism is able to release us from all former Sins.* And elsewhere he affirms; that, it causeth us as it were to be Born again. Likewise *Phil. Melanch.* saith; *The End of Baptism is the Sealing and confirmation of Pardon of Sins by the Blood of Christ.* And does not *Ananias* speak to *Saul* converted to the same purpose, *Acts. 22. 16.* *why tarriest thou? Arise and be Baptized, and Wash away thy Sins.* It seems they were to be Washed away at his Compliance with Christ's Institution, not by Virtue of the Baptismal Water, but by the Promise, by the Grace and appointment of Christ, who only hath Power on Earth to Forgive Sins. However it cannot be denied, but by that outward Act or Ceremony our Infants are received into the Church of Christ, and declared Subjects of his Kingdom. *R. M.* after a long and Impertinent Preamble comes to Answer to my former Question. *That since Infants are infected with Original Sin, how can they be cleansed without Baptism?*

To

To this he makes no satisfactory answer; But leaves them to God's disposal, and us in the dark in Relation to their future State. *Let him, saith he, who hath said, of such is the Kingdom, do with them as he pleases.* Upon what, and how many erroneous Suppositions and Mistakes do our Adversaries ground their Heretical Doctrines? These *Jewish* Children were Members of the Church, and received into Covenant with God by Circumcision. But did ever Christ declare of *Heathen* Children, or of Children uncircumcised, of Children in the polluted State of Nature, who were kept from him, and God's Ordinance, and who were yet Children of Wrath, &c. That of *such is the Kingdom* of God? Did he ever reveal his Gracious Intention towards such with respect to Salvation? Let our Adversaries flatter themselves with these absurd and unwarrantable Fancies; That the Blood of Christ will cleanse them from this Sin of Nature; That God will apply Pardon to them in his own Way; And that Elect Infants dying in their Infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit, &c. They can have no such Assurance of Salvation of their Children without Baptism from the Word of God. Nor can they be partakers of Christ's Redemption, without being brought to this Ordinance. Their presumption is intolerable to dispose of Salvation, of Heaven, of the Blood

26 *A Reply to R. Morgan,*

of Christ ; and of the Pardon of Sins, without the knowledge of God, or his revealed Will. And their Imaginations in this Case are Vain, Idle, absurd, and Impious.

R. M. proceeds on in the usual Cant of his Sect. That *'tis not likely, that God should venture their Salvation on so precarious a thing as Baptism, which may or may not be administred.* This is according to his wonted, impertinent, blasphemous and irreligious Strain. 'Tis not God that ventures. For he hath prescribed to us a Method for the Salvation of Infants, and may save them if he pleases without it. But 'tis not safe for us to venture on that, which is not revealed, and to neglect the appointed Method. Was there ever any such a profane Expression from a Christian acquainted with the Holy Scriptures? He tells us next ; *we have no Warrant from the Word of God to Baptize them to this End, &c.* This is false, as we have already proved. *R. M.* and his Sect feed and entertain their People with Lying Suppositions, Diabolical Notions and Pernicious Doctrines. Is it probable, that God should reveal in his Holy Word a Method of Salvation for the Adult, and not for Children? Is it likely that he should leave them in the State of corrupt Nature without any Assurance of being Partakers of the Redemption of Christ? We have a sufficient Warrant from Christ to Baptize our Children, intelligible to all, but to those, whom the Spirit of Error hath Blinded their understandings,

ings, that they should not perceive the Truth.

8. The last Argument is taken from the Words of Christ to *Nicodemus*, *John. 3. 5.* *Except a Person be born of Water and the Spirit, &c.* To this he brings the erroneous Exposition of Mr. Charnock to Answer for him. 'Tis strange faith he, that when all agree that the Birth spoken of here is Spiritual and Metaphorical, that the Water here should be Natural. I reply; 'Tis false, All do not agree to what he saith. And 'tis much more strange that this Spiritual Birth chiefly intended, and that requires by Christ's own Words two necessary Conditions, *To be Born of Water,* and to be *Born of the Spirit,* should have but one in this Mans's Opinion.. By the first our Saviour discovers a Necessity of complying with the outward Ordinance of God in his Church, and by the next the Renovation and Blessing of the Holy Spirit. He saith next; *None could be saved unless Baptized. If this were meant of Baptism.* I Answer; God binds us thereby to obey and submit to the revealed Method, but as he is a free Agent, he may save without it. The Spiritual Manducation that he brings to strengthen his Exposition, is Frivolous and Impertinent. The Text of *Mark. 16. 16.* *He that believeth and is Baptized shall be saved,* Contradicts his Exposition. For he saith, *Christ layes not the stress upon Baptism, but upon Faith.* Since he confesseth, that both are required, in our new Birth,

Birth, why does he exclude Water as Insignificant or not intended? He saith next, *That, the Baptism of Water was not then a standing Sacrament in the Christian Church.* I Answer, The Christian Church was not then in being till the Death and Resurrection of Christ, Eph. 2. 14. And tho' the Baptism of Christ was not then in force, that of *John* was to be complied with by all, that were to be Born again, or were to enter into the Kingdom of the *Messiah*. And when we say; The Baptism of Blood *i. e.* Martyrdom supplies the Want of Water, where Water Baptism cannot be legally administered, we do not accuse our Exposition of falsity as he falsely suggests. 'Tis Water is expressed and Blood is not Water, who knows not what this Man saith? But to this Learned Commentator I shall oppose the Judgment of a more Learned Man, Dr. Lightfoot in *Hebr. Heb. p. 77.* Christ saith he, Teaches, that *a Jew cannot enter into the Kingdom of the Messiah, unless he first passeth from the Jewish State to an Evangelical by Baptism, and afterwards from a carnal to a Spiritual. That by Water is signified Baptism I make no Question, &c.*

But R. M. boldly affirms; That Water is often in Scripture taken for the renewing, cleansing and refreshing Operations of the Holy Spirit. But this is false. Water alone is not thus taken, but when there is an Epithet to distinguish it from common Water, as *John* 7. 38. Where Rivers of living Water are mentioned: so *John* 4. 10. Therefore to take

take the Water of the Text, of *John* 3 5. in a Spiritual Sense, is a false and erroneous Exposition, contrary to the Design of Christ and the Context.

R. M. In the next place spies something that is new and strange. And what is it? 'Tis what a Number of Protestant Divines have said before me, and is agreeable with Holy Scripture. *As the Intent of Baptism is to enter us into a State of Grace, and Seal to us the Pardon of our Sins, and a Title to the Divine Favour, it may with a great deal of Reason be stiled a New Birth, without any Regard to the Birth of the Spirit.* R. M. calls this Doctrine that carries its Reason along with it, *Ridiculous and Contrary to Scripture*, but shews not in what, nor brings any Text of Scripture to prove the contrary. But treats me as *John the Botcher of Leyden* the first King of his Sect treated the Protestant Divines at *Munster*. He continued a long time in a Dream, and at his first waking he rid about the Streets upon an Ass with a fanatical Cruelty of Anabaptists at his heels, with this Litany. From *Luther, Melanchthon, and the rest of the Blind Guides of the Gospel* Good Lord deliver us. Had R. M. read the Protestant Commentators and Tracts of Divinity, he would have understood that this is no New Doctrine, Witness our 39 Articles. *Baptism is not only a Sign of Profession, &c. but of Regeneration or New Birth, &c.* And Dr. Featly saith more than I do, *such is the Vertue of the Consecrated*

Secrated Water in Baptism, wherein Christ's Lambs
 are usually Washed thro Divine Benediction,
 in that Ordinance, that tho' they were never
 so black or foul before; yet after they come
 out of the Laver, they are most clean and white,
 &c. So likewise P. Martyr de Pado-Baptis-
 mo Class. 4. C. 8. The Participation and Pro-
 mise of the Covenant is sealed to Christian In-
 fants by Baptism. In the same Language
 speaks Wendel. in l. 1. c. 22. The Principal End
 of Baptism is to signify, to seal and Sacramen-
 tally to represent the Remission of Sins, Regene-
 ration, and our Union with Christ. But my
 ignorant Antagonist understands not his
 own Catechism and Confession of Faith
 where the same Intent of Baptism by Christ's
 Ordination is asserted. That the Birth of
 Water and the Birth of the Spirit may be, the
 one without the other is to be proved by
 the Cases of Simon Magus Baptiz'd by Phi-
 lip, who was Born of Water, but not of
 the Spirit; and of Cornelius and his Compa-
 ny, who were Born of the Spirit, before
 they were Born of Water or Baptized.
 R. M. in the next Place can't Imagine,
 what I mean when I say, that Baptizo sig-
 nifies a lesser Washing, than Bapto, and where
 there is no Dipping, but only Sprinkling.
 I will not here insist upon the Texts of
 Mark 7. interpreted by Matth. 15. 2. But let
 R. M. consult Euseb. l. 3. C. 20. or 22. Where
 this Greek Author calls Sprinkling with Tears,
 Baptizing with Tears. The Story is of a
 Penitent Thief, who coming to St. John, was
 Baptized

Baptized again with Tears, the Right Hand only conceal'd or omitted, and as the English version renders it, *The Shaking of the Hand only omitted*. Here are three Arguments from this Quotation to prove Baptism signifies *Sprinkling*; 1st, none can be said with any sense to be Dipped or plung'd with Tears, but only *Sprinkled* or be dewed with Tears. 2ly, when he compares the first Baptism to this 2d, 'twas not perform'd by Dipping, but by *Sprinkling*, otherwise the Comparison had not been proper but unreasonable. 3ly *Mon apakruption ten dexian*, the Right Hand, only concealed or omitted, That is his face seem'd to be Baptized again with Tears, only the Ministers Office, who should with his Right Hand have Sprinkled the Baptismal Water, only wanting. 'Tis to be understood from these Words: That this Man was not in the Days of St. John the Apostle Baptized by Dipping but by affusion of Water and Sprinkling. Let R. M. look next into *Euseb. l. 6. C. 42*. Where he shall find *Novatus Baptized in the Bed, where he lay sick*. Is it reasonable to fancy, That this Sick Person, was immersed, plung'd, or Dipped over Head and Ears in the Bed where he lay? And *Laurentius Lucillus*, and divers other Martyrs and Confessors were Baptized in their Prisons in Chains by Sprinkling, as well as a Number of sick Persons in their Beds, and therefore the latter were call'd *Clinicks*; which

which Mode of Baptism was judg'd by all the Primitive Men a lawful Baptism, and not null and void as our erroneous and malicious Anabaptists have declar'd ours to be for that Reason. Whereas the Word us'd by Christ in his General Commission to his Apostles to Baptize in the Language he spoke, signifies to Sprinkle as Dr. *Lightfoot* and others observe. Which is sufficient to Justify our Mode of Administration. Neither can it be proved from Scripture. That Christ or his Apostles did practise Dipping at Baptism. And I have search'd from the beginning of *Genesis*, to the End of the *Revelations* in all the Word of God, in the *Septuagint* and in the Greek Testament the Word *Baptizo* is never used for Dipping; nor is it interpreted so but in the Case of *Naman the Syrian*. But there also 'tis express'd, three times by the Word *Washing*. *2 Kings* 5. 'Tis likewise observable that whenever in the Greek Bible Dipping is express'd, the Word *Baptizein* is not employed, but *Baptein*, as any Person may see in *Exod.* 12. 22. *Levit.* 4. 6. *Luke* 16. 24. *Matth.* 26. 23. *John* 13. 26. So that tho' the Word may sometimes signify Dipping, in *Hesiod*, *Homer*, *Herodotus*, *Demosthenes*, *Plutarch*, and *Ijocrates*, as also in the *Scapulas* and *Lexicons*, that interpret them, the Word must have chang'd its signification in the Days of *Ptolomy Philadelphus*, and was then commonly used by the *Septuagint*, and all sacred Writers for *Sprinkling*, as *Heb.* 9. 10.

Where

Where St. Paul affirms, That the *Levitical* Law did consist in *divers Baptisms*. Here R. M. boldly and falsely saith, that they were *Divers Dippings*, Whereas *Dipping* was never used in, or enjoyn'd in all the *Mosaick Law*. We find no other Words but *Washings*, *Bathings*, and *Sprinklings*; and as the two former are *Synonymous* and express the same Act, there cannot be found *Divers Baptisms* in all that *Economy*, unless you understand *Sprinkling* to be one. And as the two former were always with Water, the latter which was the most valuable, and the most proper and effectual for Purifications was for the most part performed, with Blood and always required, when there was a Trespass against God. If R. M's false Assertion were true that these *Divers Baptisms* were *Divers Dippings*, it had been an odd kind of Purification as impossible, as it is unlikely, that they should be plung'd always over Head and Ears in Blood. There were but two Ingredients, with which they were Baptized, *Blood* and *Water*, and two performances Washing or Bathing with Water, not Plunging or Dipping, and Sprinkling with Blood. Therefore either in reference to the Ingredients or to the Actions we cannot find in all *Moses's Law* *Divers Baptisms*, which implies different kinds, unless we admit *Sprinkling* of Blood to be one. He quotes a Passage out of the late *Arch-Bishop of York's* Sermon before *Queen Mary* March 27

34 A Reply to R. Morgan,

1692. The late *Arch-Bishop* of York Dr. *Lampugh* was then dead, and never preach'd before *Queen Mary* after her Coronation. Therefore the Reader may judge, what Faith and Credit they are to give to such a man, who stuffs his *Pamphlet* with almost as many *Lyes* as *Paragraphs*, and is continually running into Mistakes. But perhaps it is Dr. *Tillotson* late *Arch-Bishop* of *Canterbury* he means. He sends us next Mr. *Stennet's* Book against Mr. *Russen*; from whence R. M. has borrowed all his raw and imperfect Notions, which we cannot call Reasonings, but triflings. But that Gentleman's erroneous Suppositions and dangerous Principles I shall examine in my second *Antidote* against this Dipping Sect, now design'd for the Press, and there I shall give a fuller Answer to this uncivil ridiculous impertinent Heretical and Ignorant Antagonist and treat him as he deserves. Indeed I quote two Passages out of *Justin Martyr* and *Irenaus*, who mention Infant Baptism in those early days of Christianity not expressly, but implicitly plain enough to be understood. I shall not insist upon a Refutation of what R. M. saith to elude these Testimonies, I have more fully examin'd their Evidences in my second *Antidote*. *Origen* is the next mentioned for Infants Baptism. He was 17 years old when his Father was beheaded at *Alexandria* A. D. 202 as *Eusebius* saith, and was Baptized in his Infancy, about 85 years after the Death St. *John*, who lived till a-

bout

bout the year 101. He was born of Christian Parents, his Father a Martyr, his Grandfather and great Grandfather were Professors, who lived in the Apostles days. He being a man of Learning generally known and his Writings Publickly read, his Testimony is of the whole Age in which he lived and of the succeeding Ages, for he was never contradicted by any of those times in this Article. He saith *Homil. 1 on Levit. Chap. 12.* That Infants were Baptized according to the usage of the Church. And on *Rom. 6.* he affirms; That because of Original Sin, the Church had from the Apostles a Tradition to give Baptism even to Infants. There can be no plainer Evidence for the Antiquity of Infants Baptism than of this Learned Man. *R. M.* rejects the Testimony of *Platina*, who asserts the Baptism of Infants to have been in the days of *Hyginus*, but in a matter of fact both he and the Church of *Rome* are good Witnesses and rather to be credited, than any mistaken *Anabaptist*, that labours to impose upon the world the greatest Falsties. *Cyprian* Likewise speaks positively for the Baptism of Infants to have been the indisputable usage of the Churches of Christ. He was born about 100 and odd years after the Death of *St. John*, and chosen Bishop of *Carthage* about the year 248 or 250, and could not be ignorant of the Apostles practices. *R. M.* abuses me in one or two Paragraphs for the Mistakes and Errors of the Press in the first Edition. But saith he, *Infant Baptism was not spoken of till above 200 years after Christ.*

D

But

But I would ask *R. M.* if it was then spoken of as a new Practice, and how comes it to pass, that none of that Age have given us any Account of its first original? Is it probable that such a *novelty* could be introduc'd into the *Christian Church*, without any notice taken of it? And is it probable that so many Religious Martyrs of divers Nations, who were zealously affected for the maintenance of the Truth, should suffer such an alteration to pass current, without opposition? And is it probable that all Christian Nations should agree together, to admit the Baptism of Infants, if it had never been practis'd before? When he saith *Tertullian*, who flourish'd in the third Century is the first that speaks of it, he contradicts himself; for he confesseth *Cyprian* to have been chosen Bishop of *Carthage* in the year 250, who mentions and approves in express Terms of Infant-Baptism as the constant Practice of the Christian Church. And *Tertullian*, who was the first, that spoke against it, Condemns it not as a *Novelty*, which he would have done had it been newly brought into the Church. Therefore when he saith, the pure and *Apostolick Age* knew nothing of it, is false. Who are the most competent Judges of this? the Primitive Writers, *Origen*, *Cyprian*, *Optatus Milevitanus*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Ambrose*, *Chrysostom*, *Austin*, and the rest, or a handful of headstrong mechanick *Anabaptists* of these latter Ages? *St Austin* expressly saith that Baptism of Infants was an *Apostolick Tradition*, and that
he

he never read of any Sect that acknowledged the Holy Scriptures to have been against the Baptism of Infants. Therefore we may justly wonder at the Impudence of our Anabaptist Writers, who pretend to derive this pernicious Error from an Ancienter Original than *Nicholas Stork*, *John the Botcher of Leyden Tho. Muncer* and his rebellious Crue. For that reason *R. M.* answers not a word to my other Quotations, that expressely declare the Antiquity of Infant Baptism, and that it was an Apostolick Practice and a Divine Institution. My impertinent Answerer slights all the present Churches of Christ, that are for Infant Baptism without any Exception, and values their Judgments no more than of *Heathens, Turks and Papists*, and saith; *That if the Multitude of Opposers be any sign of a good Cause, they may plead for their Superstitions with too much advantage over us both.* What an unequal and irrational Comparifon is this? Of the Churches of Christ, led by the Spirit of God, enjoying all the Assistances of Humane and Divine Learning, and Revelation, with *Heathens, Turks and Papists* tutor'd up in Ignorance, Unbelief, and withal the disadvantages contrary to the Privileges of the former? If these men had the same helps to Divine knowledge as we, or the Anabaptists have, there might be some reason for such a Comparifon. But can they fancy their blue, green, and *Leathern-Apron* Teachers are more skilfull in understanding the Word of God or Antiquity, than the most Learned and pi-

ous Governours and Doctors of the Christian Church?

He saith next; That the *Protestant Churches*, whom I name are against our *Diocesan Bishops*. This is another false Assertion and Tale of *R. M's*. Invention. Tho' those Churches have not all the same Government established amongst them, as we have; they have a great Veneration for our Episcopal Order, and approve well of it, as I shall make it appear in my second Antidote and answer more punctually to all his false Accusations and impertinent Reflections, whereby *R. Morgan* has declared himself in Print to be a publick Slanderer, and to have had no regard to Truth or good Manners.

He tells us next, that they *abhor Rebaptization*, but they believe that *which Infants receive in Infancy is not Baptism, but a Nullity*. What is the Consequence of this persuasion? 'Tis that we and all *Protestant Churches* are no *Christians*, but *Heathens*, yet in the state of Nature. That all our *Bishops* and *Ministers* are no *Officers of Christ*, and have no Right to the exercise of their Functions. That all their ministrations are null and void, and that 'tis unlawful to joyn in Communion with them, or to hear them; that our *Sovereigns*, our *Kings* and *Queens*, our *Magistrates* and *Judges* are no *Christians*, and that there is no Salvation to be expected for any of us or them. This is the Charitable Opinion of this dangerous Sect, which if it had any Power over us, as they had at *Munster*, we should know more of their mind,

mind, and experience their superabundant Kindness.

He abuses *Cyprian* and the Bishops of *Africa*, and misrepresents them. They never judged the Baptism of Infants a Nullity, but were for the Practice. He thinks I odly insinuate, That they don't Baptize in the Name of the Father, &c. I cannot reckon all his Mistakes, But I had reason to question it, because the *Socinian Anabaptists* do not Baptize in the name of the Holy Trinity; what he and his do, I know not.

When he saith, that they *build not their Faith on Councils, but on the word of God*, is false. They have neither Councils, nor Fathers, nor any Text of that blessed Word rightly understood to countenance their pernicious Heresy, as I can and shall prove more fully.

R. M's seems to be displeased at my representing out of what Trades, they elect Teachers. TALLOW-CHANDLERS, PEDDLERS, TINKERS, TINMEN &c. I shall endeavour to give the Publick a List of these Jolly Bishops and Apostles of the Anabaptists *Mr. Tombes*, who was first a Surrogate, and then a Presbyterian before his Apostacy to them names these Anabaptist-Teachers a *Litter of grievous wolves*, in his Book of Scandals, Page. 323 In imitation of him and of our Protestant Divines, we may with a due regard to Truth and good Manners charge *R. Morgan and his Associates, Anabaptist-Teachers* to be a Satanical Brood i. e. Apostates no Ministers of

Christ but the Deceivers of the People. For they receive not their Commission from our Lord, but from the Suffrages of deluded Congregations, that have itching ears, 2 *Tim.* 4. 3. Their Administrations of Christ's Ordinances are null, vain and frivolous, being not warranted by the Word of God. And as they are promoters of Heresy, if the Proverb is true, where Christ hath a Church the Devil has a Chappel, we may give them the Title of the *Devil's Chaplains*, whose Interest and Kingdom they advance and increase, by keeping out of Christ's Church a number of Infant-Souls, to the apparant hazard of their Salvation.

Let the Reader judge whether *R. Morgan* hath had any regard to Truth, or good Manners, since I have proved so many Falsties and Lyes upon him, that he affirms in his Book, and since he has treated me with that rude uncivil and base Language, that becomes neither my Person nor my Character. But as I follow the Example of Christ and his Apostles to reprove the Errors and Vices of the Age, I am ready to bear as unconcern'd, with all the false Reflections and reproachfull Terms that may be cast upon me, in the discharge and exercise of my Function, and my Innocence and good Conscience will justify me before God and Unprejudiced and Rational Men. But a more perfect Answer to *R. Morgan's* unworthy and abusive Slanders Falsties and Errors the Reader shall have in my Second Antidote.

Antidote against the Pernicious Errors of the Dipping Sect. Where I shall give the History of their Rebellions proceedings both in Foreign Parts and in *England*, and Vindicate the Truth and Reasonableness of the Doctrines and Practices of our Church in other matters in Relation to this Dangerous Sect. Namely upon our *Christian Sabbath*, *Original Sin*, *Forms of Prayer*, *The Sinfulness of Schism and Separation*, upon the *Millennium*, upon *Apostacy from the Church*, and the *Sin against the Holy Ghost*, and some Remarks upon Mr. Stennet's Answer to Mr. Ruffen's Picture of the *Anabaptists*.

Now I appeal to the Impartial Readers, whether this Man, who pretends to Answer my Arguments for Infant-Baptism, has given one tolerable Reason against any of them. His Evasions and Trifling is apparent to you in every Page, and his perverting and abusing the true sense of the Word of God. And tho' they boast of the Holy Scripture, as if that were their Friend, they have not one Text rightly understood, to Favour their Pernicious Heresy, as I shall make it appear more at large in my Second Antidote. They make false Suppositions, and then argue and gather from them their false Conclusions, as Mr. Stennet has done in his Answer to Mr. Ruffen. Almost all his reasonings to Justify his Sect and Persuasion, are grounded upon Six Erroneous Principles.

First, that there is no Divine Institution for the Baptism of Infants. But the contrary

contrary is to be proved from the Command and Invitation of Christ, and from the Reason that he adds, *for of such is his Kingdom* or his Church, into which they cannot be enter'd but by Baptism; and from the other Arguments, that I shall not repeat here. Therefore his saying; That we have no Foundation for this Practice in Holy Scripture, is false.

2ly. That Infants are no Disciples, and cannot be so nominated, till they have been taught. This is contrary to *Acts 15. 10.* Where Infants at 8 Days old are stiled Disciples. And as they are Named God's Servants in his Holy Word before they can do him any Service, so they may be call'd Disciples as soon as they are enter'd into Christ's School, there to be instructed. His Reasons to the contrary are very weak, borrowed from the Adult Persons, and applied to Children, and therefore improper.

3ly. That Dipping is the only Evangelical Mode of Baptism, and that Affusion or Sprinkling is a Nullity. This he takes and Learns from the signification of the Greek Word Baptizo in *Lexicons* and *Scapulas*, where the various Interpretations are set down. But this Word is understood to *Sprinkle*, to *Wash*, or *Dip* in Greek Authors. In the Bible 'tis never render'd by Dipping, but in the Case of *Naman the Syrian*. It is always understood for Sprinkling, as I have, and shall make it appear. But where Dipping

ping is expressed, the Word *Bapto* is always used, not *Baptizo*.

4ly. That it was our Saviour's Institution, and Command to Baptize by Dipping; which is false. And that *John* and the Holy *Apostles* did Dip at Baptism, is also false, and cannot be proved by the Word of God, unless the Word *Baptize* did always signify to Dip, which it does not: 'Tis possible to go into the Water Knee Deep, and be there Baptiz'd, without plunging or Dipping. Therefore his next Assertion is likewise false.

5. That Sprinkling, or pouring of Water upon the Face, is no Baptism, and that this Sacrament cannot be duly Administred without a Total Immersion. Which was a practice taken up first by some of the Converted Gentiles from an Inclination to, and fondness of the *Jewish* Superstitious Washings of the Body, as I shall make it appear.

6. That in the first Ages of Christianity Infants were not admitted to Baptism, and that their Baptism began in the 3^d Century, is a gross Error, contrary to all the Ancient Records and derived from misapplied Quotations, and mistakes of Modern Authors. Mr. *Wall* has very well lately examin'd this Question in his History of Infant-Baptism, and proved; That it has always been the Practice of the Churches of God, since the Apostles, in all Nations to Baptize Infants. Therefore all surmises and Assertions to the contrary are false, and designed to impose upon

upon the credulous World this Pernicious Heresy of the Dipping Sect, that tends to increase, inlarge, and advance the Kingdom of Satan, and to lessen and diminish the Kingdom of Christ, by denying an Entrance to the Infants of Believers, and by continuing them in the polluted State of Nature, without any Assurance from the Word of God of Salvation, or any Right to our Saviour's Redemption. It tends also to supplant and overthrow all Christianity, by denying to us a Right to our Ministerial Functions, and instead of the true Servants of Christ, and right Stewards of the Mysteries of God amongst us, whom they reject, by substituting in their stead such Mechanicks, as have no lawful Call nor Authority from our Lord. Therefore all their Administrations are null, vain Delusions, and Cheats put upon the unadvised People, who are strangely bewitched and led into this Broad Road of Eternal Damnation, by these Factors of the Devil. How much it concerns all true Christians to be well acquainted with this Controversy and to Inform their Children, and what Guilt Persons of other Persuasions draw upon themselves before God by joining in Communion and Prayers with them, and thereby countenancing their Errors, I leave to the Reader to judge, and their Consciences to inform them.

The Word of God commands our Separation from such Impostors and Hypocrites in Religion, 2 *Tim.* 3. 5. who have nothing but

but an affected Form of Godliness, but deny the Power thereof. For of this sort are they, which creep into Houses and lead captive silly Women, laden with sins, led away with Divers Lusts, 2 *Tim.* 3. 6. Does not the Apostle plainly represent our Dipping Sect in these Words? They have most of them an appearance of mildness and sweetness in their Words and Behaviour, like him who takes upon him the Garb of an Angel of Light to conceal his foul Nature: So these his Children and Disciples cover their Malicious, Revengeful, Rebellious, and Cruel Spirit, the same that was in the German Anabaptists, with a plausible Carriage and Profession, with a visible Form of Godliness amongst us at present. And their Mechanick Teachers study to appear in the Habit and Colour of Christ's Ministers as near as they may, tho' they have for them an innate Aversion, and declare their Function to be Null by their heretical Doctrines.

But is it not strange that these Men should offer to dispossess our Children of a Right that hath belong'd to them ever since the Apostles Dayes, and continued to them so long, upon such weak and Idle Pretences? And is it not much more strange that any Persons who are gifted with any Reason should adhere and listen to such Tradesmen, to **TINKERS, COBLERS, SHOMAKERS, TINMEN &c.** who probaly cannot have had the studies

Studies knowledges and advantages of Christ's Ministers, the establish'd Teachers of his Church, and should believe those Ignorant Fellows, rather than their Spiritual Guides, God's Stewards and Officers, in this Christian Church? Is it not likewise very strange, that they should set aside their Judgments in a Practice so agreeable with all reformed Churches of Christ, and all other Churches, to follow the Dictates of such *Ignorant Deceivers*, in a Case where the Salvation or Damnation of them and of their Children is so much and highly concern'd. Let them look to it. A falling away to this Sect is a Renunciation of their former Baptism and the benefits confer'd and granted to them. 'Tis an Apostacy from their first Faith and Religion to be Dipped into this Heretical Sect, and many of them are apparently deliver'd over to a State of Reprobation, and are in the Condition of such as have committed the Sin against the Holy Ghost. So that their Repentance is impossible, as I shall prove in my second Antidote from the Holy Scriptures.

And whereas I have said P. 33. Dipping was never used or enjoyn'd in all the *Mosaick* Law 'tis to be understood of Persons to be purified, who were never commanded to be Dipped as *R. M.* falsely affirms. The Instruments of Purification the Priests Finger, the Scarlet Wool and the Hyssop were to be Dipped in Blood or Water for the Sprinkling Baptizing or purifying of the Persons or things.

F I N I S.